|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning**  **2022-2023** | | |
| Education and Behavioral Sciences | | Counseling and Student Affairs |
| Student Affairs in Higher Education 145 | | |
| Program and Assessment Coordinator: Aaron W. Hughey | | |
| ***Is this an online program***?  Yes  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here  Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.** | | | |
| |  | | --- | | **Student Learning Outcome 1:** **Demonstrates an understanding of the history and philosophical foundations of the student affairs profession.** | | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Comprehensive exam** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Individual course assignment (CNS 571): Documents Critique Assignment** | | |
| **Instrument 3** | **Internship supervisor evaluation of students completing Internship (CNS 595)** | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:** **Demonstrates an understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the learning process.** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Comprehensive Exam** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Individual course assignment (CNS 574): Compare and Critique #2 Assignment** | | |
| **Instrument 3** | **Internship supervisor evaluation of students completing Internship (CNS 595)** | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrates an ability to relate to students from different backgrounds and cultures.** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Comprehensive exam** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Individual course assignment (CNS 572): Interview Assignment** | | |
| **Instrument 3** | **Internship supervisor evaluation of students completing Internship (CNS 595)** | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:** | | | |
| These three dimensions continue to be the primary indicators of student success; therefore the next Assessment Plan will continue to assess these three areas: Students in the program demonstrate a clear understanding of the history and philosophical foundations of the student affairs profession**,** an understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the learning process, and an ability to relate to students from different backgrounds and cultures. Assignments designed to meet these three Outcomes will be refined and/or created to examine these three criteria. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Demonstrates an understanding of the history and philosophical foundations of the student affairs profession. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Comprehensive exam.All students must pass a comprehensive examination that assesses the knowledge and skills acquired through the student affairs program. The comprehensive exam is designed to assess how well students have mastered the 10 core competencies needed for success in the student affairs profession as articulated in the “Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners,” which was published jointly by ACPA and NASPA (attached). These competencies, in turn, are based on the CAS Standards for Higher Education and Student Affairs Professional Preparation Programs (<https://www.cas.edu/blog_home.asp?Display=101>). Specifically, these areas are: 1) Advising and Helping, 2) Assessment, Evaluation, and Research, 3) Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, 4) Ethical Professional Practice, 5) **History, Philosophy, and Values**, 6) Human and Organizational Resources, 7) Law, Policy, and Governance, 8) Leadership, 9) Personal Foundations, and 10) Student Learning and Development. Specifically, the Comprehensive Exam is comprised of 100 multiple-choice items (approximately 10 questions per competency area, and two essay questions designed to demonstrate the ability to apply these competencies. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students must achieve a passing score of 70% to graduate. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | The over average score across students will be no less than 70% and on no dimension (competency area) will the average score across students be less than 60%. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | This examination is typically taken during their last semester of enrollment and has both an objective (100 multiple choice items) and a qualitative component (two essay questions). | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Individual course assignment (CNS 571): Documents Critique Assignment | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall average score on the rubric will be 90% and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score be less than half the available points.  Specifically, the number of points you earn for the Documents Critique Assignment will be determined as follows:  Critical Thinking (20%) - the extent to which your critique demonstrates critical thinking skills appropriate to a graduate-level class; observations, conclusions, and inferences are reinforced by empirical evidence or outside research.  Depth of Analysis (20%) - the extent to which your critique gets to the core issues discussed by the authors in a comprehensive and detailed manner.  Integration (20%) - the extent to which you link the central themes on each of the documents to each other in a coherent and systematic way; there is an ongoing systematic evolution to these documents  Articulation (20%) - the extent to which the language in your critique is clear and precise as well as technically accurate; i.e., you use correct spelling and grammar.  Technical Competence/Visual Presentation (20%) - the extent to which your presentation is aesthetically pleasing and interesting to read; how well you are able to keep the attention of the reader. Graphics and visuals are always helpful in this regard – as long as the focus stays on what you are saying and not how you are saying it.  Each dimension is evaluated and then an aggregate score is determined. 90% an above is Excellent; 80-89% is Good; 70-79% is Marginal; Below 70% is Unacceptable. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | One hundred (100%) of the students will average at least 90%, with no dimension averaging less than half the potential points available. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | **Documents Critique Assignment.** Each student is required to read, review and provide their reaction to the six documents in the “Documents Critique Assignment” folder in the “Course Content” section of Blackboard:   * *The Student Personnel Point of View (1937)* * *The History of Student Governance in Higher Education* * *How Women Impacted the Historical Development of Student Affairs* * *The Student Learning Imperative* * *Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners* * *Toward a Sustainable Future: The Role of Student Affairs in Creating Healthy Environments, Social Justice, and Strong Economies*   All of the documents are to be reviewed collectively; i.e., develop one PowerPoint presentation that captures your review/reaction to the entire set of documents in this folder. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Internship supervisor evaluation of students completing Internship (CNS 595) | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Internship supervisors would indicate in their formal evaluation of the students they supervised that these students demonstrated an understanding of the core values of the student affairs profession. The Student Evaluation completed by the Site Supervisor is attached. The formal evaluation process asks Internship supervisors to rate items on a 6-point scale, with 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Average, 4=Good, and 5=Excellent. There is also a NA (Non-Applicable category). The overall average score on the rubric will be 4.0 and on no individual rubric item will the score be less than 2.0. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | Ninety (90%) of the students will achieve an average score of at least 4.0 across the items measured by the instrument. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | All Internship supervisors complete a formal evaluation of the students they supervised for CNS 595 (Internship). The evaluation includes items related to students’ understanding of the core values of the student affairs profession. | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results**: Students in the program demonstrate a clear understanding of the history and philosophical foundations of the student affairs profession.  **Conclusions**: We are doing an excellent job.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Refine current plan to incorporate what was learned during this cycle. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Demonstrates an understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the learning process. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Comprehensive exam.All students must pass a comprehensive examination that assesses the knowledge and skills acquired through the student affairs program. The comprehensive exam is designed to assess how well students have mastered the 10 core competencies needed for success in the student affairs profession as articulated in the “Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners,” which was published jointly by ACPA and NASPA (attached). These competencies, in turn, are based on the CAS Standards for Higher Education and Student Affairs Professional Preparation Programs (<https://www.cas.edu/blog_home.asp?Display=101>). Specifically, these areas are: 1) Advising and Helping, 2) Assessment, Evaluation, and Research, 3) Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, 4) Ethical professional Practice, 5) History, Philosophy, and Values, 6) Human and Organizational Resources, 7) Law, Policy, and Governance, 8) Leadership, 9) Personal Foundations, and 10) **Student Learning and Development**. Specifically, the Comprehensive Exam is comprised of 100 multiple-choice items (approximately 10 questions per competency area, and two essay questions designed to demonstrate the ability to apply these competencies. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students must achieve a passing score of 70% to graduate. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | The over average score across students will be no less than 70% and on no dimension (competency area) will the average score across students be less than 60%. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | This examination is typically taken during their last semester of enrollment and has both an objective (100 multiple choice items) and a qualitative component (two essay questions). | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Individual course assignment (CNS 574): Compare and Critique #2 Assignment | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall average score on the rubric will be 90% and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score be less than half the available points.  Specifically, the number of points you earn for the Compare and Critique #2 Assignment will be determined as follows:  Critical Thinking (20%) - the extent to which your critique demonstrates critical thinking skills appropriate to a graduate-level class; observations, conclusions, and inferences are reinforced by empirical evidence or outside research.  Depth of Analysis (20%) - the extent to which your critique gets to the core issues discussed by the authors in a comprehensive and detailed manner.  Integration (20%) - the extent to which you link the central themes on each of the documents to each other in a coherent and systematic way; there is an ongoing systematic evolution to these documents  Articulation (20%) - the extent to which the language in your critique is clear and precise as well as technically accurate; i.e., you use correct spelling and grammar.  Technical Competence/Visual Presentation (20%) - the extent to which your presentation is aesthetically pleasing and interesting to read; how well you are able to keep the attention of the reader. Graphics and visuals are always helpful in this regard – as long as the focus stays on what you are saying and not how you are saying it.  Each dimension is evaluated and then an aggregate score is determined. 90% an above is Excellent; 80-89% is Good; 70-79% is Marginal; Below 70% is Unacceptable. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | One hundred (100%) of the students will average at least 90%, with no dimension averaging less than half the potential points available. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | Compare and Critique #2 Assignment. Read the following two articles: *“Theories and Models of Student Development,”* and *“Identity Development Theories in Student Affairs: Origins, Current Status, and New Approaches.”* Then prepare a summary and integrated critique (PowerPoint presentation) comparing and contrasting the two perspectives, with an applications-oriented emphasis on how the information contained in these articles can be used to inform Student Affairs practice. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Internship supervisor evaluation of students completing internship | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Internship supervisors would indicate in their formal evaluation of the students they supervised that these students demonstrated an understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the promotion of student learning and development. The Student Evaluation completed by the Site Supervisor is attached. The formal evaluation process asks Internship supervisors to rate items on a 6-point scale, with 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Average, 4=Good, and 5=Excellent. There is also a NA (Non-Applicable category). The overall average score on the rubric will be 4.0 and on no individual rubric item will the score be less than 2.0. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | Ninety (90%) of the students will achieve an average score of at least 4.0 across the items measured by the instrument. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | All Internship supervisors complete a formal evaluation of the students they supervised for CNS 595 (Internship). The evaluation includes items related to students’ understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the promotion of student learning and development. | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results**: Students in the program demonstrate a clear understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the learning process; no follow-up actions needed.  **Conclusions**: We are doing an excellent job.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Refine current plan to incorporate what was learned during this cycle. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Demonstrates an ability to relate to students from different backgrounds and cultures. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Comprehensive exam.All students must pass a comprehensive examination that assesses the knowledge and skills acquired through the student affairs program. The comprehensive exam is designed to assess how well students have mastered the 10 core competencies needed for success in the student affairs profession as articulated in the “Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners,” which was published jointly by ACPA and NASPA (attached). These competencies, in turn, are based on the CAS Standards for Higher Education and Student Affairs Professional Preparation Programs (<https://www.cas.edu/blog_home.asp?Display=101>). Specifically, these areas are: 1) Advising and Helping, 2) Assessment, Evaluation, and Research, 3) **Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion**, 4) Ethical professional Practice, 5) History, Philosophy, and Values, 6) Human and Organizational Resources, 7) Law, Policy, and Governance, 8) Leadership, 9) Personal Foundations, and 10) Student Learning and Development. Specifically, the Comprehensive Exam is comprised of 100 multiple-choice items (approximately 10 questions per competency area, and two essay questions designed to demonstrate the ability to apply these competencies. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students must achieve a passing score of 70% to graduate. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | The over average score across students will be no less than 70% and on no dimension (competency area) will the average score across students be less than 60%. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | This examination is typically taken during their last semester of enrollment and has both an objective (100 multiple choice items) and a qualitative component (two essay questions). | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Individual course assignment (CNS 572): Interview Assignment | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall average score on the rubric will be 90% and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score be less than half the available points.  Specifically, the number of points you earn for the Interview Assignment will be determined as follows:  Critical Thinking (20%) - the extent to which your critique demonstrates critical thinking skills appropriate to a graduate-level class; observations, conclusions, and inferences are reinforced by empirical evidence or outside research.  Depth of Analysis (20%) - the extent to which your critique gets to the core issues discussed by the authors in a comprehensive and detailed manner.  Integration (20%) - the extent to which you link the central themes on each of the documents to each other in a coherent and systematic way; there is an ongoing systematic evolution to these documents.  Articulation (20%) - the extent to which the language in your critique is clear and precise as well as technically accurate; i.e., you use correct spelling and grammar.  Technical Competence/Visual Presentation (20%) - the extent to which your presentation is aesthetically pleasing and interesting to read; how well you are able to keep the attention of the reader. Graphics and visuals are always helpful in this regard – as long as the focus stays on what you are saying and not how you are saying it.  Each dimension is evaluated and then an aggregate score is determined. 90% an above is Excellent; 80-89% is Good; 70-79% is Marginal; Below 70% is Unacceptable. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | One hundred (100%) of the students will average at least 90%, with no dimension averaging less than half the potential points available. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | Interview Assignment. Each student is to interview three students and prepare a PowerPoint that summarizes these interviews. If you interview three students from the same institution, please be sure to exhibit diversity in your selection process (i.e., for example, do not interview three students with similar backgrounds – include students from different age categories, genders, racial/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, religious preferences, sexual orientations, etc.). If you interview students from different institutions, it is more acceptable to interview students with similar demographic characteristics (i.e., for example, three traditional age, Greek-affiliated students from three different undergraduate institutions would be acceptable). Ask students about their college experience, for example:   * Why did you enroll at the undergraduate institution you are attending? * If they were given the chance to decide again, would you still choose to attend the same institution? * How many members of your family attended college? * What do you like about college? * What do you not like about college? * Is college what you thought it was going to be like? * What have been the biggest challenges/barriers/obstacles you have encountered in college? * What would make your college experience more enjoyable? Rewarding? Effective? * Are your needs (physical, psychological, educational, emotional, spiritual) being met in college? * What services/support would make your college experience more successful? * Do you see college as essential to future success in your career? Life? * And any other questions you feel would be appropriate, interesting, insightful or revealing.   Prepare a single PowerPoint in which you summarize, compare and contrast, and interpret what you think the information you obtained through these interviews means. Also include what you feel are the implications for practice in your presentation. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Internship supervisor evaluation of students completing internship | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Internship supervisors would indicate in their formal evaluation of the students they supervised that these students demonstrated a clear understanding of diversity and has the ability to relate to students from different backgrounds/ cultures. The formal evaluation process asks Internship supervisors to rate items on a 6-point scale, with 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Average, 4=Good, and 5=Excellent. There is also a NA (Non-Applicable category). Students who receive an average score of 3 or above on the designated items are considered to meet the criteria. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | Ninety (90%) of the students will achieve an average score of at least 4.0 across the items measured by the instrument. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% achieved the indicated target. | |
| **Methods** | All Internship supervisors complete a formal evaluation of the students they supervised for CNS 595 (Internship). The evaluation includes items related to students’ understanding of diversity and the ability to relate to students from different backgrounds/ cultures. | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results**: Students in the program demonstrate an ability to relate to students from different backgrounds and cultures.  **Conclusions**: Bottom line: We are doing an excellent job.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Bottom line: Refine current plan to incorporate what was learned during this cycle. | | | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: Students in the program demonstrate a clear understanding of the history and philosophical foundations of the student affairs profession; students in the program demonstrate a clear understanding of student development theory and its relationship to the learning process; and students in the program demonstrate an ability to relate to students from different backgrounds and cultures.  **Conclusions**: The Student Affairs program is poised to become of the premiere graduate preparation programs for the student affairs profession. The program currently has a national reputation and is well-respected within the profession; both can be enhanced, which could result in expanded enrollments and the need for additional faculty. Specifically, we would like to see the number of students entering and completing the program double over the next 5-7 years. The only real potential impediments to reaching this goal could be the ever-increasing tuition and fees associated with pursuing graduate education at WKU and the ability of units across the campus to support our graduate students through the provision of Graduate Assistantships and other paraprofessional employment opportunities. Bottom line: We are doing an excellent job.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: The following actions will be taken in support of the ongoing Assessment of Student Learning: 1) *Clearly communicate the degree value on the Student Affairs program website.*Benchmarked institutions include detailed descriptions of the benefits of attending its program. Competitors include information on the program website dedicated to discussing beneficial program features – such as small class sizes, practice-focused learning, promising career outcomes, and learning from faculty with professional experience in student affairs occupations. WKU should consider altering the present narrative description on its program website to expand on the aforementioned messaging. Currently, the WKU website highlights “theory-based yet applications-oriented program,” “meaningful supervised practicum and internship experiences,” and how the program prepares “students to obtain entry and mid-level student affairs professional positions.” Consider including features like class-size, employment data, and/or spotlighting the experience and outcomes of recent program graduates.  *2) Explore the possibility of developing specializations.* There is an anticipated labor market need for student affairs professionals to have both generalist and specialized knowledge – and no other benchmarked program currently has specializations. Hanover recommends developing a specialization to differentiate from competing programs. Top specialization opportunities include social justice and inclusion; assessment, evaluation, and research; and advising and supporting. 3) *Consider developing a non-credit graduate certificate in student affairs.* Current student affairs professionals view specialized certificates as one of the most valuable forms of professional preparation. Certificates offer similar competencies as full graduate programs with the additional benefits of lower costs and a shorter time commitment. Non-credit certificates are also open to students who are not enrolled in graduate programs, and a new non-credit certificate program at WKU may appeal to students from more diverse educational and experiential backgrounds. If WKU develops a non-credit certificate program, it should focus on including in-demand competencies like leadership, social justice and inclusion, student learning and development, assessment, evaluation and research, and advising and supporting. WKU should also maintain an in-person component with a hybrid delivery for the certificate - incorporating in-person experiential learning opportunities either on campus or in settings close to students’ locations and online delivery for coursework. Bottom line: We plan to refine current plan to incorporate what was learned during this cycle. |

Curriculum Map

**Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SLO 1** | **SLO 2** | **SLO 3** |
| CNS 571 | **X** |  |  |
| CNS 572 |  |  | **X** |
| CNS 574 |  | **X** |  |
| CNS 595 | **X** | **X** | **X** |

**Core**

**Courses**